

**MINUTES  
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
EDINA PARK BOARD  
HELD AT CITY HALL  
JUNE 9, 2015  
7 p.m.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Gieseke called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

**II. INTRODUCTION OF NEW PARK BOARD MEMBER, KOREN HAWK NELSON**

Chair Gieseke introduced new Park Board Member Koren Nelson. Member Nelson gave the Park Board a brief history of herself.

**III. ROLL CALL**

Answer roll call were Members Jacobson, Good, Jones, McCormick, Gieseke, Segreto, Strother, Greene, Nelson

Member Cella arrived at 7:13 p.m.

Student Members Chowdhury and Colwell

Absent: None

**IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA**

**Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Good, approving the meeting agenda.**

Ayes: Jacobson, Good, Jones, McCormick, Gieseke, Segreto, Strother, Greene, Nelson

Motion approved.

**V. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA**

**Member Good made a motion, seconded by Member Strother, approving the consent agenda as follows:**

**IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Park Board Meeting of Tuesday, May 12, 2015**

Ayes: Jacobson, Good, Jones, McCormick, Gieseke, Segreto, Strother, Greene, Nelson

Motion approved.

**VI. COMMUNITY COMMENT**

None

**VII. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**VII.A. Park Recreation and Trails Strategic Plan**

Ms. Kattreh introduced Terry Minarik from Confluence to the Park Board.

Mr. Minarik went over the Executive Summary and Implementation Framework of the Park Recreation and Trails Strategic Plan.

Member Good stated on page 10 before the gray boxes on the left side it looked like under average items there were trails and total trail mileage and he thought this was mentioned as something behind benchmarks. Mr. Minarik thought what skews it is they put in the Nine Mile Creek Trail as part of that.

Member Good stated on page 14, he liked the fact that the key projects were bolded now but to note on point four it looks like there is a duplication of point five added on to it. He stated the last thing would be because the points are there, the key recommendations on page 17 are now repetitive and could be removed. Mr. Minarik thanked Member Good for the changes.

Member Segreto asked if the icons on the list of projects, one through twelve, meant the project is a higher priority. Mr. Minarik stated it applies to more of the guiding principles. It is the way they derived it and based on that they would assume that the more guiding principles they are covering would make them higher priority of the project because it hits more of the key points in the process.

Member Segreto stated the one item she was always looking at is number three and she wondered why that would not have a scale of justice on it and have four next to it because she did not want to lose that one in a four rating or a two-star rating. Member Good stated that at least on number three, it is one of the top twelve. Member Segreto thought that was great but would like to see the justice scales next to it. Mr. Minarik indicated that could be modified.

Chair Gieseke stated he understood there was more thought given to progress measurement which was important as they put this in place and he wondered if they could discuss how they imagine that taking place. Ms. Kattreh stated she and Mr. Minarik talked about this in the last month and one of the things that they added to the strategic plan is an annual report. They want to move that to the top priority list for 2016 and what she would see it going through as one of the items on the annual report are items that are listed as priorities, specifically guiding principles and make sure they address the progress they made in achieving those. She stated funding is going to be critical for some of these items.

Member Nelson asked in terms of that are they going to add in the annual plans the ongoing maintenance of the existing parks and making sure they are keeping up on the existing parks. Ms. Kattreh indicated that was correct. She stated what they will probably do is come up with a template of an annual report and run it by the Park Board to make sure they are covering everything the Park Board wants to see.

Mr. Minarik stated this is jumping to the last point but the progress for measurement creates an outline on how that can be measured through quantitative and qualitative data within however the projects are accomplished. That will help develop the framework on how they are analyzed.

Member Jones stated the Strategic Planning Committee has never discussed most of this report. At the last meeting, three months ago, there was not a draft version of the strategic plan. They were still working on the guiding principles and those were not part of the draft the board saw last month so some of the principles in this report are still not what was discussed at the last meeting. She stated some of her concern which she thought should be discussed would be changing the vision statement which has not really been discussed by the board. They had a vision statement and now it has changed and procedurally they never voted on that change. She believed they should still approve the wording on the guiding principles.

Member Jones stated the similar provider section in the executive summary is extremely vaguely worded but is more troubling that there are twenty pages that are included in the document based on Weber Consulting Group. The facility inventory was conducted by Weber Consulting in 2014 and has been inserted into the document nearly verbatim but she believed it should be taken out of the document and was not administered or reviewed by the Park Board and was never presented to the Park Board and was limited in scope to council prescribed potential uses for Grandview and does not include all facilities. The list of limitations and inaccuracies in that report is long. She thought the pages should be removed.

Member Jones stated in the executive summary section staff perspectives are being mixed in with the community needs assessment and should be separated because she valued the staff perspectives. She stated they are leaving out some major amenities from their benchmark analysis and she did not understand why. They have not discussed at all the level of service analysis and there is no mention of

location or lack of location for amenities in the report. What is missing are fitness, art centers and pools in the level of service section.

Member Jones stated there are some things missing in the guiding principles section. They were going to talk about promoting social and geographic equity and she did not know how that got lost and they do not have any kind of geographic equity mentioned. Park classifications have never been discussed by the committee. She wondered if the reclassification of parks be a part of the key projects for a strategic plan and not just changed as part of the strategic plan. She did not believe there was any hurry to approve this plan and she wanted to make sure this is the best work effort they put forward and at this point she was not certain this was that type of product.

Member Segreto agreed that they have not been involved in many of the things described but to have been involved in those discussions would have protracted the Strategic Plan for a long time. For them to protract this for another year may exceed the budget and what they are talking about, if as a group, they are not happy with this document as their strategic plan, then they need to come up with more money for the strategic planning. She did not know how much longer they can keep planning.

Chair Gieseke indicated this is the end of the process and Member Jones has brought up some items that are really protracted and would take some time. They are important items but the board needs to take a step forward and they can always revisit those items at greater length as they go through the process. This is not the end of the process.

Member Jones stated the reason why she brought up all of the issues is because this document was not vetted by a committee before coming to the board and she wanted that to be very clear and she felt this policy is going to be with them for a long time and it concerns her that some of the items have not been covered.

Member Good stated he saw this as a framework to help them make choices and this does give them a framework to help them make choices. They do not need to have all of the information included and set in stone. What is important is that they have enough information in the document to help them make decisions. He stated because this is considered a living document he expected the board to make changes to this document even after it is approved because there will be sections that need to be reworked for more detail and he is open to that as a board member. He agreed they needed to move this item forward.

The board discussed the options they can take for further discussion of the items Member Jones brought up.

Mr. Minarik stated Member Jones brought up vision and guiding principles and thought if there was something in there that she was uncomfortable with as a board member then they should be discussed.

Member Jones thought there were a couple of wording tweaks that was talked about in the committee and the biggest one happens to be the one with respect to develop creative funding opportunities and programming partnerships to ensure excellence in facilities, programs and financial stewardship for future generations. She stated when the committee discussed this, the guiding principle had to be was about financial responsibility in a broad sense and the guiding principle was not that as a guiding principle they always wanted to look toward funding opportunities and programming partnerships but they were looking for maximizing available resources by prudently managing department operations and creating creative funding methods. Something broader that included both the creative funding opportunities and included something that would allow them to reevaluate programs that are run inefficiently and then to make changes. This guiding principle does not speak to that.

Member Jones stated the other guiding principles: “Providing excellence in innovation in parks and recreation services to meet the needs of the community” should have the words “and facilities” added to the end.

Member Jones stated on the section of promote social equity she would add something about geographic equity to it.

There was board discussion regarding geographic equity and accepting donations.

Member Jones stated they need to think about strategically locating their resources and that there is some type of geographic equity and thought this is worth trying to solve.

Member Jacobson suggested they just strike the word “social” and leave equity. Chair Gieseke indicated he liked that and opens it up for discussion and does not trap them. Member Jones indicated she actually liked that as well. Member Nelson thought part of that is going back to making sure they have an assessment of all the parks and making sure they understand where the needs are on a yearly basis.

Member Jones stated her last change would be one on the guiding principles. She would take out the word “by engaging” and put in the word “for”.

Member Good stated he has done some work on these and offered a suggestion on the finance. He would add the sentence “Protect Edina’s assets through strong financial stewardship and creative funding.” Member Jones indicated she liked that.

Mr. Minarik continued on with the presentation to the board.

Member Jones stated her other request would be to take out the Weber Consulting report on pages 39-59. It can be placed as a reference in the document but is not a good piece of research. Mr. Minarik stated in defense of that they put the report in as an exhibit of relative similar providers within the area and did change some things that were not applicable. The report helps as a placeholder for some things that need to be included in the future.

Member McCormick stated the way it was described makes her feel it should be put in the document as an appendix. Member Good agreed and indicated it should be placed in the back of the document. He understood why it is in the document but should be used only as an exhibit. Mr. Minarik stated they can make reference to it and include it in the back of the document.

Member Jones stated in the Executive Summary she would like to separate staff comments from the community needs assessment. She thought it would read cleaner if it was kept to what was found in the community needs assessment. Chair Gieseke asked if there was harm being done by having them put together. Member Jones did not think that the community has been asked to give their opinion on a lot of things and she felt this section should only be resident input. She thought it is even clearer when it is not staff driven. Member Good agreed and stated that if this is a listing of needs they should pull the solution out because they come later.

Mr. Minarik offered a solution. They could provide all of the community input they have received and the board could base it on a priority list and what they would like to show in this so everyone has a chance to vote on what the key things are. They could also provide an appendix with everything that was provided in the community survey and comment. Member Jones thought the solutions just need to be removed.

Member Strother indicated she did not have a problem with that but the second bullet point with the natural resource inventory, she did not know if she saw that as a solution. Member Jones stated she could see that as a vague item and was fine with it. Chair Gieseke agreed and indicated the one where it talks about city staff would like to see possible partnerships explored and seems to be an add-on.

Member Good asked if budget and funding as a high priority come from community needs or was that something the Park Board identified. Mr. Minarik stated it was identified in different ways and a compilation of things.

Member Jones stated when she talks with people, she thought there was more desire for something that was more multi-generational and she did not see that. She wondered if that was further down on the list. Mr. Minarik stated that came up in our committee discussions at a higher level. It does not tend to come up as much when talking in general terms with residents.

Member Jones thought that services for seniors, particularly fitness facilities was top five on their community needs assessment survey. Mr. Minarik did not think it was but would check on it.

Member Jones stated regarding the level of service on multi-use fields in 2019, in 2014 they need five and in 2019 they need one and wondered if that was correct, likewise with multi-use trails. It looked like they are going down in amounts. She thought they may want to add wording indicating it is based on population and not location of facilities.

Member Nelson wondered if Mr. Minarik had the definitions of the different classifications. Mr. Minarik noted it was in the document on page 283.

Mr. Minarik reviewed with the board Van Valkenburg Park and noted it does not have a typical play area or other amenities seen in a particular park so it is on the border of special use park.

The board discussed previous discussions regarding Van Valkenburg Park.

Member Nelson stated one thing she would like see added to the guiding principles or the needs assessment is they should make sure they are continuing to upkeep the parks they do have. Member Good indicated it comes up in the 12 key objectives they have in the document.

Member Jones thought they talked about adding a word to number seven such as “systematically go through the Master Plan.” Ms. Kattreh thought maybe Mr. Minarik could add this to the implementation system. Mr. Minarik noted it is listed in the appendix.

Chair Gieseke thanked Mr. Minarik.

## **VII.B. Parks & Recreation Department Project Update**

Ms. Kattreh and Ms. Susan Faus, Assistant Director Parks & Recreation, gave updates to the Park Board.

Member Jacobson asked what the status was of Arden Park. Ms. Kattreh stated they are currently redoing a lot of streets in that neighborhood and a sidewalk and trail along the eastern edge of the park is part of that process. The bridge will be replaced over 54<sup>th</sup> Street and a trail will be added along the east side of the park.

Chair Gieseke asked if there was going to be a canoe area to portage through. Ms. Kattreh stated she would have to review the plans because she did not remember what the resulting discussion was for that.

Member Strother asked in regards to Weber Woods, was there a discussion about residential use for part of the property. Ms. Kattreh stated with the Weber Woods property, two thirds of the park is in Edina and about a third of it is in the City of St. Louis Park and the City Council members and St. Louis Park wanted to reserve the right to potentially add one or two residential lots on the very northeast corner of the property off France Avenue. The City of Edina is making a separate purchase offer with the City of Minneapolis based on a price they negotiated with them to have a park use only with no residential development and the City of St. Louis Park is negotiating a different purchase agreement with a different purchase price based on leaving the opportunity for them to add one or two residential lots there.

### **VIII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS**

#### **VIII.A. Council Updates**

No discussion.

#### **VIII.B. Other Correspondence**

Member Good wondered if the board could get a brief overview on the donation from the Edina Garden Council of \$30,000. Ms. Kattreh reviewed the information with the board.

Chair Gieseke asked how the relationship stood with the Garden Club. Ms. Kattreh hoped it was good.

A member of the Garden Club spoke to the Park Board. Ms. Kattreh explained the city's point of view regarding this item. Member Jones thought the Arneson Acres park was designated as a horticultural park and it seemed as if the park use was possibly going to change, which troubled her. Ms. Kattreh stated this is very premature and there has been no discussion about moving the buildings.

Member Segreto asked if Arneson Acres Park by deed restriction is a horticultural park. Ms. Faus was not sure and could not find anything regarding that. Member Segreto stated this is a special park and would not want to see that change.

#### **VIII.C. Veteran's Memorial Committee, March 27, 2015 Minutes**

No discussion.

### **IX. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Member Jones indicated Tin Fish is a great addition to the golf course. She indicated they could use some bike racks. Ms. Kattreh stated they will be added soon.

Member Good stated now that the City Council has accepted the recommendation of the 18-hole course, he found the book that showed the transformation of the 27-hole course to be very useful and would suggest they recommend they do the same thing now that it is going to be 18. Ms. Kattreh stated that's a great point and would second that. The first step will take place at the City Council meeting and they need to finalize the plan. She would bring this forward.

Member Good stated in regards to the retreat, he would like a discussion around the budgeting and funding process and how that works. He also wondered if they should also go in depth on some of the items listed in the Strategic Plan at the retreat and spend some time discussing what they really mean.

Student Member Colwell and Chowdhury updated the board on their plans this summer and after high school.

Member Nelson asked how they are marketing some of the things the Park Board has done and grand openings. Member Strother stated they could post online "Next Door" social site that advertises

community events. Ms. Kattreh thought they can do a better job. She thought they could post on the city website, City Extra and The Neighborhood.

**X. STAFF COMMENTS**

No discussion.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Chair Gieseke made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, to adjourn the meeting at 8:59 p.m.**

Ayes: Jacobson, Good, Jones, McCormick, Gieseke, Segreto, Strother, Greene, Nelson, Cella

Motion approved.

Meeting adjourned at 8:59 p.m.